

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-18 are pending in the present application.

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed May 30, 2006. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. He also rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blount et al. (U.S. Patent 4,974,197) in view of Dorricott et al. (U.S. Patent 6,272,606). In addition, the Examiner indicated allowable subject matter for claims 4, 7, 13, and 16 if they are rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph and in independent form including the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant has canceled claims 1-3 and 10-12, amended claims 4, 5, 7 and 13-16. Reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

### **I. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. More particularly, the Examiner stated "As to claim 1 and 10, lines 3-4, it is not understood what is the relationship between "serial numbers" and "generating job" and what is updated in a database in a server. Applicant has cancelled claims 1 and 10 but amended claims 4, 7, 13 and 14 to clarify the relationship between a serial number and

“generating job” and what is updated in a database in a server. As cited in amended claims 4, 7, 13, and 14, a serial number is assigned to a storage media, a batch data is a function of a job and the updated in a database is the updating of information in the storage media from a database in a server. The rejection is now moot. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

## **II. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated “Claims 4, 7, 13 and 16 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.” Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for these allowable claims. As stated under section I Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 of this response, Applicant has made amendments to the claims accordingly to overcome the rejection. Applicant also rewrote claim 4, 7, 13 and 16 to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims according to the Examiner’s recommendations. Applicant believes these claims are in condition for allowance.

## **III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,974,197, issued to Blount et al. (“Blount”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,272,606 issued to Dorricott et al. (“Dorricott”).

In view of the above remarks under section II Allowable Subject Mater, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is now moot.

Therefore, Applicant believes that independent claims 4, 7, 13, 16 and their respective dependent claims are distinguishable over the cited prior art references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**


In view of the amendments and remarks made above, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully solicited. If it is believed that a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of the present application, or clarify matters with regard to its allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any required fees associated with this Communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 04-1175.

Respectfully submitted,

DISCOVISION ASSOCIATES

Dated: 08/28/06

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Caroline T. Do, Esq.  
Reg. No. 47,529

DISCOVISION ASSOCIATES  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT  
2265 E. 220<sup>th</sup> Street  
Long Beach, CA 90810  
(310) 952-3312 (direct)

P:\ABG\PPD\IA\1501\01A\AMEND\_04.DOC